



MEMORANDUM

TO: Karen Chad, Vice-President Research
Jay Kalra, Chair, Planning and Priorities Committee of Council

FROM: Jim Basinger, Acting Associate Vice-President Research and
Chair, Implementation Team for the Management of Centres

DATE: February 18, 2010

RE: *Final Report of the Implementation Team for the Management of Centres*

As a final task as Chair of the Implementation Team for the Management of Centres, I am pleased to provide you with the Final Report of the Implementation Team. The mandate of the Implementation Team was to consider the recommendations of the former Task Force on the Management of Centres and submit a report to the Vice-President Research and the Planning and Priorities Committee of Council on the advisability and feasibility of their implementation. In reviewing the recommendations of the Task Force report, the Implementation Team determined to focus on the development of reporting and review processes for centres, as these represented the areas upon which the majority of the Task Force recommendations impinged.

Accordingly, the Implementation Team met on seven occasions between September 9, 2009, to January 27, 2010, and initiated a broad consultation on the proposed centres reporting and review processes, which included Members of the Associate Deans Research Forum, Centres Forum, Deans' Council, the Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work Committee of Council, and centres directors. In addition, the team conducted a broad scan of centres policies and practices at major universities across Canada.

The proposed reporting and review processes outlined in the attached report and accompanying templates was developed based upon a set of guiding principles as outlined in the report. The processes were also developed to be harmonious with the university's framework for assessment as outlined in *A Framework for Assessment: Beyond Systematic Program Review*. Most importantly, the Implementation Team approached the development of the review process from the view of recognizing the many accomplishments and contributions of centres across the spectrum of research, teaching, outreach, and service and ensuring their integration within the university's integrated planning process.

With the submission of its report, the Implementation Team is dissolved. Further consideration of the report and its release to the broader community is now at the discretion of the Office of the Vice-President Research and the Planning and Priorities Committee. However, I would be pleased to clarify or amplify on any aspects of the report, and wish to convey to you my appreciation for the contributions of the members of the Implementation Team in producing the report now before you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jim Basinger", written in a cursive style.

Jim Basinger

Attachment: *Final Report of the Implementation Team for the Management of Centres*

REPORT OF THE IMPLEMENTATION TEAM FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF CENTRES

PREAMBLE

The Implementation Team for the Management of Centres and the former Task Force on the Management of Centres follow upon the directive within the university's Policy on Centres, "*to establish the appropriate mechanisms to give assurance of relevance and continued viability in a changing environment, and to acknowledge the high demands for accountability and transparency.*"¹

The Implementation Team, in reviewing the recommendations of the Task Force report, focused specifically on the development of reporting and review processes for centres to assist centres in the achievement of their goals and to assist the reporting authority for the centre in being fully engaged with the centre. The reporting and review processes are intended to be relevant across the various types of centres, which encompass a wide diversity of reporting structures, activities, funding arrangements, and interactions with others.

The review process presented is intended to augment the work of centres and provide recognition of the many accomplishments of centres across the spectrum of research, teaching, outreach, and service. In the past, the achievements of centres have been recognized in an *ad hoc* fashion, leaving many centres directors and members to believe the activities and accomplishments of centres are unrecognized, unvalued and unrewarded. Likewise, there has been no formal means by which to acknowledge and address the barriers that exist for centres to accomplish their stated goals and objectives. The reporting and review processes proposed in this report provide opportunities to address both of these dimensions, and further support centres in being recognized as meaningful participants within the university's integrated planning process.

In recognition of and in support for the diversity of centres, the review process has been structured so that the authority and responsibility for the review are devolved to the centre director and reporting authority, rather than through a central coordinating office. Within the framework provided, the centre director and reporting authority for the centre are primarily responsible for decisions regarding the nature and scope of the review, selections of reviewers, standards for assessment, and outcomes desired. By employing a process that provides for autonomy for many of the decisions related to centres, the Implementation Team has attempted to maintain the flexibility that currently exists with respect to centres, but clarifies the responsibilities and accountabilities of centres within the university's structure and within the context of integrated planning.

¹ *University of Saskatchewan Policy on Centres*, March 2004

BACKGROUND

The Implementation Team for the Management of Centres was constituted to review the recommendations of the Task Force on the Management of Centres. Specifically, the Task Force was mandated to:

- Develop guidelines for the assessment of centres and propose a mechanism to support such assessment; and
- Develop guidelines for the effective management of centres including, but not limited to, governance structures, financial viability, and resource support.²

The Task Force's Final Report was released in April 2007, and included 23 recommendations regarding the reporting, review, governance, and finances of centres.

To advance the work of the Task Force, the Implementation Team for the Management of Centres was created in September, 2009, under the offices of the Vice-President Research and Provost and Vice-President Academic. The mandate of the Implementation Team was to carefully consider the Task Force recommendations with a view to their implementation, culminating in a report to the Vice-President Research and the Planning and Priorities Committee of University Council, at which time the team would be dissolved. The membership and terms of reference of the Implementation Team are found in Appendix A.

In its consideration of the Task Force recommendations, the Implementation Team determined to focus on the areas of the development of: (1) a reporting mechanism for centres; and (2) a review process for centres. The basis for this decision was the number of key recommendations within the Task Force report hinging upon these aspects. Further, the Task Force Report identifies that, "*These reporting and review requirements were seen to be valuable for a variety of reasons including accountability and transparency, but also as a means to advertise, communicate and even boast about accomplishments*"³. In addition, by definition a formal reporting and review process for centres would ensure that the university-level concerns regarding the governance and finances of centres would be addressed through the process. Specific issues related to governance and financial aspects were viewed by the Implementation Team as more appropriately falling under the authority of the reporting authority of the centre.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

In addressing its mandate, the Implementation Team arrived at a number of principles to guide its work:

- That the review process developed be flexible and inclusive regarding the timing and nature of the review, the selection of the review team, and the process for conducting the review.

² *University Task Force on the Management of Centres: Discussion Paper*, February 2006

³ *Final Report of the Task Force on the Management of Centres*, April 2007

- That the reporting and review processes developed not be particularly onerous, administratively or financially, or duplicate existing review processes.
- That the review process not be managed through a central, coordinating office, although the Institutional Planning and Assessment Office would be available as a point of consultation. Rather, the responsibility and planning for the process should be devolved to those most directly involved: the centre director and the reporting authority for the centre (e.g. Dean, VPR).
- That the review process developed be aligned with the principles articulated within the university's assessment framework: *A Framework for Assessment: Beyond Systematic Program Review*.
- That the review process provides a forum for highlighting the diversity of centres and their many successes and contributions.
- That the standards by which centres are assessed are directly aligned with the centre's own stated goals and objectives.
- That the review process result in a renewable term for each centre, tied to the review process.

CONSULTATION

The Implementation Team sought broad and collegial consultation throughout the university community, seeking feedback and suggestions for improvement on the proposed reporting and review processes and related templates from members of Deans' Council, the Associate Deans Research Forum, Centres Forum, the Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work Committee of Council, and centres directors. A summary of the groups that participated in the consultation process is attached as Appendix B. The Implementation Team gratefully acknowledges the assistance and feedback received from those consulted.

In addition, the Implementation Team conducted a broad scan of the centres policies and practices at major universities across Canada as a first step in considering its mandate.

CENTRES REPORTING AND REVIEW PROCESSES

To assist units in preparing annual reports and undergoing review, the Implementation Team prepared a number of templates. The "snap-shot" template (Appendix C) is intended to provide a web presence for all university centres, accessed through the university calendar and periodically updated. At a glance, pertinent details of the centre will immediately be apparent, including the goals and objectives of the centre, types of activities undertaken, governance, and membership. The details indicated for internal use will assist the university in better understanding the administrative reporting structure and financial scope of its centres.

The annual report template (Appendix D) is intended to assist centres in preparing their annual reports, and expands upon the information requested in the “snap-shot” template to allow the centre to elaborate upon its activities and speak to its accomplishments. An annual financial report is a key aspect of the annual report, and the template for a financial statement (Appendix E) is configured upon the university’s UniFi accounting system. The timing of the submission of the annual report is flexible, as determined by the centre director and reporting authority for the centre, based upon the centre’s fiscal year-end. The implementation team recognized there are many centres on campus which already prepare detailed annual reports. For these centres, there is no need to prepare a separate annual report; however, the report format should be reviewed to ensure the report includes the substantive elements outlined in the template.

The reporting and review processes outlined in Appendices D-F are intended to apply universally to all centres. However, the manner in which they are approached exists as a point of negotiation between the centre director and the reporting authority for the centre, based upon the centre’s unique situation. In particular, the timing of the review is not prescribed or externally imposed. In general, unless there are extenuating factors, reviews are intended to occur no sooner than every five years, and at most, ten years apart. If an existing review process is already employed, the centre may elect to build upon the review to avoid duplication, again ensuring the substantive elements outlined in the proposed review process are included. For those centres involved in the delivery of programs, the centre review will likely coincide with the planned review of the programs associated with the centres.

In consideration that the university’s centres vary widely in size and scope and in the nature of the activities they undertake, the review process is designed to be simple and flexible, utilizing the standard components of a self-study document and external review. The intent is that the self-study document be succinct and not overly onerous to produce, with much of the material readily available through the centre’s annual reports. Reviews will be conducted by teams of three individuals, including at minimum one external reviewer. In this regard, the external reviewer(s) selected is an important consideration, providing objective insight and clarity to the process. In keeping with the principle for devolution of the review process from a central agency, the selection of reviewers is made by the reporting authority for the centre, in consultation with the centre director and in consideration of recommendations by the centre director.

Most importantly, the standards by which the centre will be assessed are directly related to the centre’s own stated goals and objectives. In addition, university-level guidelines on standards for assessment have been developed (see Appendix G) to assist centres and their reviewers in conducting the review in the context of the university’s broad aspirations for centres as expressed in the preamble to the centres policy: *“Centres are intended to strengthen, coordinate or facilitate scholarly purposes or activities not readily undertaken within the University’s departmental and unit structures, and are intended to offer new areas of activity consistent with the University’s strategic direction and priorities.”*⁴ A key purpose of the review is that the outcomes be integrated with the university’s planning processes in order to enhance the academic interests and goals of the university.

To ensure the continued vitality and vibrancy of the university, the outcome of the review process will lead to the establishment of a term for each centre, which will be tied to the next review of the centre. The reviewers’ report will inform the decisions made regarding the future of the centre; however, the authority to determine the continuation of the centre rests with the reporting authority for the centre, in

⁴ *University of Saskatchewan Policy on Centres*, March 2004

consultation with the centre director. If the centre is not meeting its goals and objectives, the reporting authority may recommend dissolution of the centre, or may consider restructuring of the centre to permit the centre to continue its activities, for instance as a research group, but without the status of a university centre. Failure on the part of the centre to submit an annual report may also form the basis for dissolution of the centre, given the accountability dimension inherent within a reporting mechanism, with the submission of annual reports a fundamental indicator of the centre's engagement with the university.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to enact a reporting and review process for centres, and to provide for a method for dissolution of a centre, a number of revisions to the centres policy and guidelines are recommended, including:

- That the centres policy include a review process for centres, which would include reference to the identification of a term for each centre to coincide with the next review of the centre;
- That the centres policy include the requirement for each centre to report annually;
- That the centres policy emphasize the importance of the integration of centres into the university's integrated planning process;
- That the guidelines for applications for the establishment of centres direct that the goals and objectives of the centre be developed in anticipation of a future review;
- That a process for dissolution of a centre be established, which would include consideration of any legal agreements, financial or otherwise, physical and human resources, and the effect on teaching and any other obligations of the centre;
- That procedures and authority for approval for dissolution of the centre be consistent with that required for establishment of the centre.

COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH REVIEWS

The Implementation Team was very much aware of its call upon university resources to support the centres review process, and financial exigency was the primary reason for the recommendation that the majority of reviews for college centres (type A) occur at a distance, and that it would be reviews of university-level centres (types B&C) that would involve site visits by external reviewers. A cost-shared model to support centres review is recommended, with shared contributions from central university resources combined with college and unit resources.

CONCLUSION

The initiative to create an “implementation team” to consider the management of centres, arose from the desire to assist centres and those they report to in developing, guiding, and enhancing the contributions of centres as an integral part of the university landscape. Coupled with the desire for a clearer articulation of the many centres on campus, was the accompanying desire to provide a means to more effectively recognize and celebrate the many accomplishments and contributions of centres.

The Implementation Team’s focus on the creation of a reporting mechanism and a review process for centres is intended to strengthen university centres, promote accountability and transparency, and provide centres directors and those they report to with the series of tools to assist in the management of centres. With the submission of its report, the Implementation Team will dissolve, leaving the recommended policy revisions to be considered and enacted by the Planning and Priorities Committee of Council. Upon receipt of the centres review process by Council, the request for the “snap-shot” templates will be initiated as the first outcome of the process. The initiative to implement the formal reporting and review process, if not already in existence, remains in the hands of the reporting authorities for centres to enact.

In conducting its work, the Implementation Team was struck by the immense diversity of centres across campus and their many contributions to the vitality and creativity of the university in its pursuit of research, teaching, scholarly and artistic work, and in meeting the needs of the community at large. The Implementation Team believes that a clear and coordinated reporting and review process as outlined within will assist centres in their management, and thereby facilitate centres to achieve their highest aspirations.

Respectfully submitted:

Jim Basinger (Chair)
Sandra Calver (Administrative Support)
Patricia Farnese
Jim Germida
Karsten Liber
David Parkinson
Kevin Schneider
Lorraine Shantz
Ken Van Rees

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Implementation Team Mandate and Membership

Appendix B: Consultation Summary

Appendix C: Status 'Snap-Shot' Report Template

Appendix D: Annual Report Template

Appendix E: Financial Template

Appendix F: Centres Review Process

Appendix G: University-level Guidelines on Standards for Assessment

Appendix H: University of Saskatchewan Policy on Centres (March 2004)

Appendix I: Guidelines for the Establishment of Centres (June 2008)

Appendix J: Task Force Report on the Management of Centres (April 2007)

Appendix K: University List of Units, Centres, Divisions, Institutes and Groups (as of February 2010)

Appendix L: *A Framework for Assessment: Beyond Systematic Program Review* (December 2008)

APPENDIX A: IMPLEMENTATION TEAM FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF CENTRES

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Background

In May 2006 the Office of the Vice-President Research launched a Task Force on the Management of Centres charged with developing a series of recommendations on the management and assessment of centres at the University of Saskatchewan. Specifically, the Task Force was mandated to:

- Develop guidelines for the assessment of centres and propose a mechanism to support such assessment; [and]
- Develop guidelines for the effective management of centres including, but not limited to, governance structures, financial viability, and resource support.¹

The Task Force's *Final Report* was released in April 2007 (presented to University Council in September 2007 through the Planning and Priorities Committee of Council) and included 23 recommendations (attached) addressing assessment, financial policy, resource allocation, management, governance, and accompanying responsibilities and accountabilities for centres from across the University.

Implementation Team Mandate

Implementation of the recommendations of several task forces associated with the Office of the Vice-President Research and undertaken during the first planning cycle was one of the initiatives identified in the *Office of the Vice-President Research Unit Strategic Plan (2008/09 – 2011/12)*. Further, "it is now an institutional responsibility to implement the collegially developed recommendations [and] to continue the forward momentum initiated ... as attempts are made to overcome management challenges, operational concerns, and other issues specific"² to the work of task forces including the Task Force on the Management of Centres. The mandate of this Implementation Team will be to ensure that the extensive work and thoughtful recommendations put forward by the Task Force are not overlooked or left unattended to, and instead considered and where appropriate and feasible, are put into action. Keeping in mind that the Task Force Report was tabled in April 2007, the institution must also address emerging issues concerning the management of centres.

The Implementation Team's mandate will include, but need not be limited to, the following:

1. Careful consideration, review, and prioritization of:
 - a. the recommendations of the Task Force on the Management of Centres; and,
 - b. emerging issues concerning the establishment and management of centres;

¹ *University Task Force on the Management of Centres: Discussion Paper*, February 2006

² *Office of the Vice-President Research Unit Strategic Plan (2008/09 – 2011/12)*, p. 42.

2. Discussion and consultations with those to be involved in the implementation of recommendations;
3. Development of strategies for implementation of processes for the management of centres;
4. Submission of recommendations to the Vice-President Research and Planning and Priorities Committee of Council.

Further details of the mandate will be finalized by the Implementation Team membership.

Implementation Team Membership

Given the breadth of types of centre across campus, the Implementation Team will need to demonstrate sensitivity to this diversity and membership will include representation of centres of various types. A proposed membership for the Implementation Team is outlined below:

Members

Vice-President Research or Designate (Chair)

Representation from each of:

- Provost and Vice-President Academic
- Associate Deans Research Forum
- Planning and Priorities Committee of University Council (from representatives named to the Centres Subcommittee)
- Type A Centre Directors from the University of Saskatchewan (1)
- Type B/C Centre Directors from the University of Saskatchewan (1)
- Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work Committee of University Council.

Resource Personnel

Administrative support will be provided by the Offices of the University Secretary and the Vice-President Research.

Meeting Schedule

The frequency of meetings of the Implementation Team will be determined as needed at the discretion of the Chair.

Timelines

The Implementation Team will be launched in early 2009 and will submit its recommendations to the Vice-President Research and the Planning and Priorities Committee of Council by January 2010.

IMPLEMENTATION TEAM FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF CENTRES MEMBERSHIP

Vice-President Research (designate)

Jim Basinger, Chair Acting Associate Vice-President Research

Provost and Vice-President Academic (designate)

Jim Germida Vice-Provost Faculty Relations

Associate Deans Research Forum

Kevin Schneider Vice-Dean, Science, College of Arts and Science

Centres Forum

Karsten Liber Director, Toxicology Centre
Ken Van Rees Centre for Northern Agroforestry and Afforestation

Planning and Priorities Committee of Council

David Parkinson Interdisciplinary Centre for Culture and Creativity

Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work Committee of Council

Patricia Farnese Law

Financial Services

Lorraine Shantz Budget and Special Projects

Administrative Support

Sandra Calver (Secretary) Coordinator, University Governance, University Secretariat

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE TASK FORCE ON THE MANAGEMENT OF CENTRES

1. The reporting authority for Centres needs to be reviewed to ensure that Centres are not disadvantaged in consideration of resources and that their activities and plans can be properly reflected in Integrated Planning documents and university promotional materials.
2. A clear rationale for reviewing Centres must be established. The rationale should include:
 - The means to provide the Centre and the University with information which will assist in improving the quality of research and outreach activities and infrastructure of Centres;
 - The means to guide decisions with respect to the allocation of resources to Centres; and
 - The means to assess a Centre with respect to the achievement of its goals and objectives and to determine whether the goals and objectives need to be revised or the Centre restructured or dissolved.
3. A statement in the Policy on Centres needs to be made about the responsibilities and authorities of Deans/VPs to which Centres report. A clear delineation of the reporting authority's responsibilities should also be included in the documentation approving the establishment of a Centre. The list of responsibilities should include:
 - Recommending the establishment/dissolution of the Centre;
 - Approving the annual budget;
 - Operational and financial monitoring including receiving and, following discussions with the Director, approving the annual report;
 - Establishment of a regular review process (see recommendation 4, below).
4. The Dean to which a Centre reports should be the individual who is responsible for the review. It is expected that in fulfilling these responsibilities the Dean will consult with the Centre members and Director, and with the Department Head where the Centre significantly impacts, or resides primarily within, a Department. The Dean's responsibilities include:
 - Determining the cycle of review (see 6, below);
 - Determining the size and scope of the review process (including whether the review will be paper-based or involve an on-site visit by a review team; where a Centre is automatically reviewed by some external agency, the Dean to whom it reports should have the right and responsibility to exempt it from an additional review as appropriate). Where a review is to be primarily paper-based, the Dean should consider making available an opportunity for the reviewers to consult with the Centre members via video- or tele-conference;
 - Establishing the terms of reference for the review committee and determining its membership (whether internal [U. of S.] or external reviewers, or both);
 - Receiving the review report, providing an opportunity for the Centre to respond, evaluating the review and response, and forwarding the review and response with recommendations to the Planning Committee of Council for its information and further action if necessary or appropriate.
5. As each of these types of Centres receive university resources and have broad impacts often extending into the local, provincial or national communities, a rigorous review process should be put in place. It is strongly recommended that the process involve an on-site visit by a review team consisting of at least 2 external reviewers. The VP to which a Centre reports should be the

individual who is responsible for the review and it is expected that in fulfilling these responsibilities the VP will consult extensively with the Centre Director and members. The VPs responsibilities should include:

- Determining the cycle of review (see 5, below);
 - Determining the size and scope of the review process (including whether the review will be paper-based or involve an on-site visit by a review team; where a Centre is automatically reviewed by some external agency, the VP to whom it reports should have the right and responsibility to exempt it from an additional review as appropriate). Where a review is to be primarily paper-based, the VP should consider making available an opportunity for the reviewers to consult with the Centre members via video- or tele-conference;
 - Establishing the terms of reference for the review committee and, in consultation with the Director and members, determining its composition;
 - Receiving the review report, providing an opportunity for the Centre to respond, evaluating the review and response, and forwarding the review and response with recommendations to the Planning Committee of Council for its information and further action if necessary or appropriate.
6. Reviews of Centres should be on a cycle of review consonant with the University's Integrated Planning Cycle. Unless special circumstances prevail, reviews should be a minimum of 5 and a maximum of 10 years apart. Reviews should be staged, like the SPR process, so that the entire process is manageable and not too much effort and stress is placed on any single unit.
 7. The Centre Director/CEO, in consultation with the members of the Centre, should be charged with creating a self-study document which would include a clear statement of the goals and objectives of the Centre and documentation pertaining to the achievements of the Centre with respect to said goals and objectives. Included, wherever and whenever possible should be surveys of the 'clients/benefactors' of the Centre regarding their interactions and satisfactions with the Centre and suggestions for improvement.
 8. Resources to support reviews of centres should be dependent on the type and size of centre that is reviewed. The costs of reviewing Centres which report to a Dean should be borne by the College to which they report. Funding for reviews should be provided from central sources for those Centres which report to a Vice-President.
 9. Academic units and College Review Committees should be reminded and encouraged to value and reward all types of activities that are considered to be of value to the University. One opportunity to value these activities is to celebrate significant Centre accomplishments in College and University promotional materials. Centre Directors should provide to the Dean or VP to whom they report copies of press releases, notifications of grants received, and other significant accomplishments.
 10. Colleges need to recognize, and Deans should ensure, that participation and accomplishment within a Centre is considered in recommendations and decisions about tenure, promotion and special salary increases.
 11. VPs to whom Centres report should work with Centre Directors to routinely provide input to Heads and Deans about the activities and accomplishments of Centres and particularly about the activities and accomplishments of Centre Directors.

12. From the perspective of the Centre, its members, and the university, it is highly desirable that an adequate infrastructure and operating/research budget be in place when a new Centre is approved. Where it is uncertain that the proponents of a proposed Centre have secured adequate resources and yet it is decided to create the Centre, a specified and relatively early date for the first review should be established.
13. Space Planning should be charged with reviewing the entitlements of currently existing Research Centres and, where possible, providing adequate space.
14. VPs and Deans to which Centres report should, in reviewing the annual report and budget of the Centre, discuss the needs of the Centre with the Director.
15. Centres, like Departments and administrative units, should receive invitations to participate fully in University planning and budgeting exercises.
16. Centre Directors should be invited to College meetings and be given the opportunity to annually address the meeting and present a report.
17. A University-wide forum of Centres should be created, chaired by the VP Research, to meet at least once per term to discuss matters of mutual interest.
18. Centres should be required to provide annual financial reports for each year of the review period. For larger Centres, the reports should include a Statement of Revenue and Expenditures with the current year's actual results, a comparison to the budget for the current year and a comparison to the actual results for the previous year. If the Centre has significant long-term tangible capital assets, a description and, where possible, cost and age of these assets should be provided. The Statement of Revenue and Expenditures and a list of long-term tangible capital assets (where relevant) are the minimum expectations. Centres should be encouraged to prepare additional information, such as variance analysis, for their own use as well as to serve the review process. Such Centres should ensure that they have the administrative support required to track revenue and expenditures and generate reports. Centres with little financial activity should have a reporting requirement restricted to a Statement of Revenue and Expenditures which display current year's actual results and a comparison to the actual results for the previous year.
19. If Centres form a part of the College structure they should be included in growth and development planning.
20. The Dean/VP to which a Centre reports should develop a protocol for actively managing the financial matters of the Centre. A description of the protocol should be included with any application for the establishment of a new Centre.
21. Type A Centres should be required to establish clear governance arrangements. The Dean to whom each Centre reports should be involved in the discussions of these arrangements. The discussions should consider whether a Management/Advisory Board is necessary or appropriate and whether the Dean will serve (ex officio) on the Board. The arrangements would normally include at least one annual meeting between the Dean, the Centre Director, and the Board if it exists.

22. The role, responsibility, and authority of the Dean to whom a Centre reports must be clearly identified in all proposals to establish a new Centre (see Recommendation 2) and in all existing Centres where it is unclear. Some aspects of the role would include leadership and encouragement and, where the Dean deems it necessary, appropriate and the opportunity exists, lobbying and fund-raising on behalf of the Centre; the Dean's authority would include the recommendation (to Council) to establish or dissolve a Centre, approval/dismissal (following consultation with the members of the Centre) of an individual to the position of Director, and assignment of space and other resources under the control of the Dean. The responsibilities of the Dean would include such matters as oversight over the financial operations of the Centre, ensuring that the Centre is aware of and follows University policies and practices, and the review of the Centre.

23. The role, responsibility, and authority of the VP to whom a Centre reports must be clearly identified in all proposals to establish a new Centre and in all existing Centres where it is unclear. Some aspects of the role would include leadership and encouragement and, where the VP deems it necessary, appropriate and the opportunity exists, lobbying and fund-raising on behalf of the Centre; the VP's authority would include the recommendation (to Council) to establish or dissolve a Centre, approval/dismissal (following consultation with the members of the Centre) of an individual to the position of Director, and assignment of space and other resources under the control of the VP as approved by the President's Executive Committee and/or the Provost's Committee on Integrated Planning. The responsibilities of the VP would include such matters as oversight over the financial operations of the Centre, ensuring that the Centre is aware of and follows University policies and practices, and the review of the Centre.

APPENDIX B: CENTRES REPORTING AND REVIEW

IMPLEMENTATION TEAM CONSULTATION

Research, Scholarly and Artistic Work Committee of Council
November 13, 2009

Centres Forum
November 20, 2009

Associate Deans Research Forum
November 23, 2009

Deans' Council
November 24, 2009

Centres Directors
November 30, 2009 and December 4, 2009

APPENDIX C: TEMPLATE FOR CENTRES 'SNAPSHOT' STATUS REPORTS

[TITLE OF CENTRE] STATUS REPORT [insert url for Centre website]

The following is intended for posting on the university website:

As briefly as possible, provide a description of the following (1-2 pages).

Mission:

Goals and objectives of the centre:

Types of activities undertaken to achieve mandate: e.g. research; graduate student training; student experience; programming; outreach

Governance:

Attach the current membership of the director, executive, and any advisory bodies.

Attach a list of current centre members, including external members and member terms where relevant.

The following is intended for internal use only

Date of last annual report submitted to university senior administrator (e.g. Dean, VPR):

Centre type (e.g. A B C D):

Date established:

Administrative reporting structure:

Statement of Operating Revenue and Expenses (attach most recent statement).

APPENDIX D: TEMPLATE FOR CENTRES ANNUAL REPORTS

[TITLE OF CENTRE] ANNUAL REPORT

Centre's mission:

Goals and objectives of the Centre, including their relationship to the university's strategic goals and objectives:

As briefly as possible describe how the centre has worked to reach its goals and objectives during the last year (e.g. research; graduate student training; student experience; programming; outreach).

Describe any significant changes that have occurred since the last annual report (for example, changes in activity, membership, governance) and how they have impacted the centre's activities.

Describe any activities/interactions with the larger community beyond the campus of the University of Saskatchewan.

Provide a list of centre members and membership terms, if applicable.

Provide a list of students (undergraduate, graduate), postdoctoral fellows, and visiting scholars who worked within the centre during the last year.

Summarize those significant accomplishments which can be attributed to the centre since the last annual report. What distinct opportunities does the centre create or have access to that would not be available if the centre did not exist? What distinguishes the centre from other entities? What are the direct outcomes of the resources invested in the centre?

Summarize the artistic and scholarly contributions and external funding relevant to the centre's mission and objectives attained by the centre's members.

Provide an annual financial report that identifies the fiscal year end for the centre. The report should include a Statement of Revenue and Expenditures consistent with the financial template provided (attached). The financial report should include a reflection of the in-kind resources received by the centre. The in-kind resources may be part of the Statement of Revenue and Expenditures or provided as a textual description within the report. Please comment on expenditures showing how they support the objectives of the centre. If the centre anticipates a significant expenditure to replace capital assets in the upcoming year, please provide a brief description and estimate of the replacement cost.

APPENDIX E: FINANCIAL STATEMENT

Financial Statement for _____
 Fund Number(s): _____
 Fiscal Year End: _____
 For the Period: Month/Year to Month/Year

| | Budget Reporting Year (eg: 2009-10) | Actuals Reporting Year (eg: 2009-10) | Budget Upcoming Year (eg: 2010-11) |
|--|---|--|--|
| OPERATING REVENUE: | | | |
| Grants and Contracts that support centre operations: | | | |
| Government of Canada | | | |
| Government of Saskatchewan | | | |
| Other Governments | | | |
| Non-government | | | |
| Industry | | | |
| Donations | | | |
| External Sales | | | |
| Operating Allocation (from UofS central fund) | | | |
| Miscellaneous Income | | | |
| TOTAL OPERATING REVENUE | - | - | - |
| OPERATING REVENUE EXPENSES: | | | |
| Salary Expenses: | | | |
| Salaries | | | |
| Benefits | | | |
| Total Salary Expenses | - | - | - |
| Non-Salary Expenses: | | | |
| Materials and Supplies | | | |
| Printing and Photocopying | | | |
| Communications | | | |
| Professional Fees | | | |
| Externally Contracted Services | | | |
| Internally Purchased Services | | | |
| Other Operational Expenditures | | | |
| Travel | | | |
| Cost of Goods Sold | | | |
| Maintenance, Rental, and Renovations | | | |
| Scholarships, Bursaries, and Prizes | | | |
| Capital Assets (Computers, Furniture, Equipment, Software) | | | |
| Internal Cost Recoveries | | | |
| Total Non-Salary Expenses | - | - | - |
| Interfund Transfers: | | | |
| (Revenue/expenses from another UofS College/Unit) | | | |
| (Identify sources/uses) | | | |
| Total Interfund Transfers | - | - | - |
| TOTAL OPERATING REVENUE EXPENSES | - | - | - |
| Total Revenue less Expenses | - | - | - |
| Fund Balance, Beginning of the Fiscal Year | - | - | - |
| Fund Balance, End of the Fiscal Year (must reconcile to UniFi) | - | - | - |

APPENDIX F: CENTRES REVIEW PROCESS

The centres review process supports the comprehensive assessment strategy and broad principles for quality assurance, quality improvement, and accountability articulated within the university's *Framework for Assessment: Beyond SPR*. The review process is intended to be flexible and collegial, providing centres with the opportunity to benefit from insights obtained through self-reflection upon progress towards stated goals and to benefit from the feedback of others. Likewise, the review process is intended to be formative and will evolve over time.

Although there is no central coordination of centre reviews, the University's Institutional Planning and Assessment Office is a resource and point of contact regarding assessment.

NOTICE AND TIMING OF REVIEW

Notice of the review will be communicated to the centre director by the reporting authority for the centre. Reviews will occur at a minimum of five and a maximum of ten years apart. An earlier review may take place if significant concerns are expressed related to the centre's governance and/or financial status, or in relation to fulfillment of the centre's mission and goals.

The timing and nature of the review will be determined through discussion of the reporting authority for the centre with the centre director and will include consideration of whether the review will involve a site visit by the external reviewer(s). The decision regarding a site visit will be based in part upon financial considerations, with most college-based centres undergoing review at a distance. If the centre is involved in an existing review process, including for example, program review or assessment by an external agency, the centre's review may complement the existing process by ensuring the substantive elements of the process outlined as follows are incorporated within the review.

SELF-STUDY/SELF-ASSESSMENT REPORT

The self-study report should succinctly summarize the centre's activities, achievements and contributions since last reviewed and in relationship to the university's integrated plan and relevant college and unit plans. The report should be written based upon consultation with the centre's staff, members, colleagues, stakeholders, and students associated with centre activities, and upon the annual reports submitted during the review period.

The self-study should include the following, as appropriate, given the nature of the centre's mandate and function:

- A statement of the centre's goals and objectives and how the centre has achieved its objectives;
- A detailed description of the centre's governance;
- Current membership list as defined by the centre [this may include, for example, the director, members of any advisory body, faculty and staff members];
- A current list of all students, graduate students and post-doctoral fellows associated with the centre;
- A plan identifying future directions and development strategies;
- A report on the centre's activities and contributions to the university community and others, including any academic programs associated with or offered by the centre;
- An indication of those synergies and opportunities afforded the centre as an entity distinct from more traditional structures, and which would not be available otherwise;
- An indication of any operational barriers or impediments to success which may exist for the centre, and their impact upon the ability of the centre to achieve its objectives and goals;
- A multi-year financial plan identifying annual operating costs, continued and potential sources of revenue, and strategies for acquiring funds on a sustainable cost-recovery basis;
- A recognition of in-kind resources received by the centre;
- Letters of support for the centre's renewal from key stakeholders, including confirmation of any continuing resource commitments to the centre; and
- The most recent annual report(s), including annual financial statements, attached as an appendix.

APPOINTMENT OF REVIEW TEAM

In general, the review team will consist of a minimum of three members, who are not associated directly with the centre. Within the team, at least one member will be internal to the university and at least one of the remaining members will be external to the university, with external assessment considered an essential feature of the review.

The reporting authority for the centre will normally be responsible for selection of the review team, in consultation with the centre director. The centre director will have the opportunity to nominate individuals the director believes most qualified to serve as reviewers. Members may include: a senior researcher with administrative experience and no direct involvement with the centre; the director of another comparable centre; a researcher who is not affiliated with the centre, but who is knowledgeable in the field of activity; other members as deemed appropriate.

The review team will develop its own process for conducting the review, in consultation with the reporting authority for the centre and based upon the guidelines provided. Each centre is responsible for identifying those to be consulted during the review and will propose the timing and format of site visits by reviewers, if applicable. In general, the review process for site-based reviews should involve both formal and informal meetings with the centre director and any advisory bodies, representatives of external partners or funding agencies or other identified stakeholders, and including students.

UNIVERSITY-LEVEL GUIDELINES ON STANDARDS FOR ASSESSMENT

To assist centres and reviewers in determining the standards by which centres should be assessed, a set of guidelines outlining the university's broad expectations for centres is attached. These are intended to broadly outline the categories for assessment and inform the centre director and reporting authority in developing the centre's own terms of reference for the review, based upon the goals and objectives of the centre.

REVIEWERS' REPORT

At the outset of the review, the reviewers should be provided with direction regarding the nature and expectations of the report, including consideration of any confidential aspects within the report and how these will be handled. The report should specifically address the centre's progress towards meeting its goals and objectives, as expressed within the terms of reference for the review developed by the centre director and reporting authority. In general, the primary focus of the review is an assessment of the extent to which the centre has fulfilled its objectives and continues to meet the definition of a centre, the appropriateness of its future goals, and its current and projected financial viability. The integration of the centre within the university and value added by the centre to the university as a whole is also a key dimension of the review.

The reviewers' report will be submitted to the reporting authority for the centre and to the centre director. The centre director will have the opportunity to respond to the report and ensure there are no factual errors prior to release of the report to the Planning and Priorities Committee of Council. The expectation is that the reviewers' report will also be shared with members of the centre.

The terms of reference developed for the review should accompany the reviewers' report. The intent is that the terms of reference developed be made broadly available to inform the university's review process for centres over time.

REVIEW OUTCOME

The reviewers' report, including findings and recommendations of the Planning and Priorities Committee, will serve as advice to the reporting authority in the determination of outcomes of the review process. An outcome of the review will be the establishment of a term for each centre, extending to the next planned review of the centre. If continuation of the centre is not to occur, the process leading to dissolution of the centre will be initiated by the reporting authority for the centre.

A decision to discontinue a centre will require a plan to phase the centre out of existence developed by the reporting authority for the centre, in consultation with the centre director, which will address, among

other issues, the consideration of any physical and human resources and any related legal and contractual agreements, including collectively bargained agreements. The plan will be submitted to the Planning and Priorities Committee of Council. University Council and/or Board of Governors approval will be sought for the dissolution of the centre as appropriate and consistent with approval required for establishment of the centre.

The process leading to dissolution of a centre may be initiated in response to a negative review; however, a negative review may also result in restructuring of the centre to strengthen and enhance its activities. The dissolution of a centre may also be initiated at the express wish of the centre director and members at any time. Further, dissolution of the centre may be an outcome initiated upon failure of the centre to submit an annual report in the absence of any mitigating factors, given the importance of reporting annually as a fundamental responsibility of all centres, demonstrating accountability and engagement.

APPENDIX G: UNIVERSITY GUIDELINES ON ASSESSMENT STANDARDS FOR THE REVIEW OF CENTRES

From a university-level perspective, a key outcome of the centres review process is a clearer understanding of how the centre could advance its goals and objectives, and enhance the university's research, teaching and service activities and profile. In addition to this broadly-set expectation, each centre will also have the opportunity, in consultation with the reporting authority for the centre, to establish its own individual terms of reference for the centre's review. These terms will uniquely reflect the desired outcomes from the review and take into consideration the scope of the review, as determined, among other considerations, by the size and diversity of the centre, centre type (college situated or cross-college), mission, and mandate of the centre.

As part of the review process, the following broad guidelines are intended to assist and guide centres and reviewers in assessing the degree to which centres meet, aspire towards, and exceed the university's expectations of the wide array of centres it encompasses.

Each centre will have a clearly outlined and articulated set of goals aligned with the university's strategic goals and priorities. The centre will exhibit self-knowledge and insight regarding its aspirations and the challenges and opportunities that exist relative to its goals.

For centres focused primarily on research, the centre will have an established research profile, evidenced by the centre's research activity and engagement, which contributes to the university's research, scholarly and artistic work profile. The centre's pursuit of excellence in scholarship and collaborative research will enhance the university's research intensiveness and undergraduate, graduate, and post-doctoral research training.

For centres focused primarily on service, the centre will have an established service model, evidenced by the centre's efficient, relevant, and innovative service delivery, which enhances the ability of the university to deliver a broad array of services. The centre will be attuned to the needs of its clients, and its relationship and contributions to the university.

For centres focused primarily on teaching and learning, the centre will be engaged in innovative programming, evidenced by a supportive learning environment and collaborative modalities, which contribute to the university's educational goals. The centre will aspire towards the delivery of undergraduate and graduate programs of the highest quality to achieve excellence in teaching and learning.

The accomplishments of the centre will be tangible and measured against the objectives, goals, and mandate of the centre. The centre will provide evidence in support of its stated accomplishments. If evidence in support of the centre's achievements is not available, the centre will indicate what steps are required to enable the centre to report in the future on key activity and output indicators.

The centre will adopt the university concepts of outreach and engagement, evidenced by interaction with external communities and flexible partnerships. The centre will partner with others outside the university, through the sharing of knowledge and resources, to enrich creative activity, address societal issues and contribute to the public good.

The centre will influence aspects related to the university's core mission for research, teaching and learning, and service. Regardless of the centre's primary orientation, the centre will exhibit an integrated approach in its pursuits. As an example, the research efforts and results from a research-based centre, should also inform the university's teaching and learning activities and desire for enhanced interdisciplinary scholarship.

The centre will add value to the institution as an entity distinct from the traditional structures of a department, school, or college and the *ad-hoc* nature of a research group. The centre will exist to accomplish a unique goal that could not be accomplished as effectively through another existing structure. The vitality of the centre will be immediately evident in its activities, which will cross boundaries and create novel synergies.

The activities of the centre will be integrated within the university, to benefit the university as a whole. The centre will be engaged in and responsive to the university's integrated planning process and strategic goals. The relationship and governance of the centre within the university will be collaborative and enhance the university's commitment to work more effectively across unit and institutional boundaries. The alignment of the centre to the university's strategic goals and partnerships will ensure the centre is a fully integrated and contributing member to the university.

The centre will effectively deploy existing resources and actively seek new resources. The centre will actively seek to leverage external funding and efficiently manage its resources, including in-kind resources, to sustain the activities of the centre on a long-term basis. The centre will proactively develop a plan to remediate any financial deficit.